

candidate for mayor and carried the city by a plurality of four thousand in a total vote of fifty-three thousand, defeating both the republican and the democratic candidates.

San Francisco has been the seat of labor troubles for some months past. It will be remembered that the iron workers struck early in the summer and that many other trades unions went out or were locked out as a result. An association called the Employers' association tried to compel teamsters to abandon their unions, and the trouble continued until about the time candidates were nominated for city offices. As Mayor Phelan, the democratic candidate, was elected two and four years ago, and as the republican candidate this time was second in the race, it is evident that a large proportion of the democratic strength went to the labor candidate. This is proof, first, that the wage-earners constitute a larger element of the democratic party than of the republican party, and, second, that democratic wage-earners are an independent class of voters who cast their ballots according to their judgment. There are so many local questions involved in a municipal campaign that the readers of *The Commoner* scattered throughout the country may not be able to pass judgment upon the issues which the citizens of San Francisco had to act upon, but it is interesting to every one to know the power that the laboring men have when they choose to exercise it. If they would show the same earnestness all over the country they would prove a most effective, if not an irresistible, force in reform movements. If the laboring men who are in the habit of supporting the republican ticket would by their votes make it known that they could not be counted upon to aid a party controlled by banks, corporations, syndicates and monopolies, the republican leaders would find that no corporation funds, however vast, could secure them a national victory.

A Prophecy That Failed.

In the campaign of 1900 the republican leaders denied that their party contemplated a permanent increase in the standing army. They asserted that a large army was only necessary because of the insurrection in the Philippines, and they boldly declared that the insurrection would cease immediately if the republican ticket was successful. The democratic platform and democratic speakers were blamed for the prolongation of the war. "Just re-elect President McKinley," they said, "and let the Filipinos know that they are not to have independence, and they will lay down their arms and our soldiers can come home."

Well, the republican ticket was elected, and the Filipinos were notified that they were not to have independence, but a month after the election the republicans rushed through congress a bill authorizing the president to raise the regular army to 100,000, and now, after a year has elapsed, the insurrection is still in progress and the end is not yet. Some of the worst losses of the year have been suffered by our troops within two months. General Chaffee reports that the Filipinos have profited by the deception practiced upon them when Aguinaldo was trapped. He says that "insurgent soldiers in ordinary civilian's dress lurked about and among American garrisons," and he adds that "with deceptive cunning they obtained credentials from American authorities." We were assured a year ago that only a small fraction of the Filipinos were hostile to the American government. We were told that the great majority of the Filipinos welcomed the American government and were glad to be made subjects. The *Times-Herald* quotes General Chaffee as saying that "the whole people of the Philippines are engaged in waging war upon the United States." The *Times-Herald* (a republican paper) adds: "The Filipinos who are friendly to the United States are said to be those holding office, and the officers who discussed the situation today assert that their loyalty

will continue only so long as they have the opportunity of drawing American dollars."

If Mr. McKinley was correctly informed when he stated that most of the Filipinos were friendly, then the insurrection has, according to General Chaffee, increased rather than diminished.

After the republican victory made it impossible for the imperialists to blame the anti-imperialists for the continuation of hostilities, the republican leaders declared that Aguinaldo, actuated by selfish ambition, was compelling his countrymen to continue the war. But even after his capture and imprisonment—yes, even after his captors had secured from him an address advising his comrades to surrender—the insurrection continued. How long will it take the imperialists to learn that we can never have peace in the Philippine islands? That we can suppress open resistance is certain, although the cost may be far beyond any gain that can be derived from a colonial government, but that we can ever make the Filipinos love us or trust us while we rule them through a carpetbag government, is absurd.

If the republicans had read the speeches of Abraham Lincoln as much recently as they did in former years, they would have known that hatred of an alien government is a natural thing and a thing to be expected everywhere. Lincoln said that it was God Himself who placed in every human heart the love of liberty. Lincoln spoke the truth. Love of liberty is linked to life itself, and "what God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

Democratic Leadership.

The *Chicago Chronicle*, emboldened by the success which has in some quarters attended the efforts made to reorganize the democratic party, comes out with the demand for new leadership. It wants a new platform, candidates who are acceptable to the moneyed interests and an organization that will draw its sinews of war from the corporations, and then conduct the government according to the plans and specifications furnished by the corporations. It says:

It is not surprising that with a presidential candidate and these managers from states at a far distance from the business and political center of the country the democratic party has been defeated disastrously in two campaigns and finds difficulty in rising from its overthrow. In the future such states as are now republican, but may be gained by the democrats, must furnish the democratic managing committeemen as well as the democratic national candidates. * * *

Not only must the new leaders be from the central states, but they must be familiar with all classes of our people—with the educated, the enterprising, the prosperous, with those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests, with the farmers of the great agricultural states, with the educators and professional men of the country. * * *

In democratic party management the frontiersmen must give way to representatives from those parts of the country that have emerged from limited backwoods views of public affairs, of politics and statesmanship, of education and progress, of the methods of which a great party may be led along the lines of enlightened policy, attract adherents from the best elements of citizenship, gain the support of independent voters and gain all those forces by which an apparent minority in the campaign is swelled into a majority at the ballot box.

We are to have leaders who are familiar (why not intimate?) with the "educated, enterprising and prosperous" and with "those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests."

Probably the *Chronicle* would consent to have the word "educated" stricken out if the party would agree to consult only the "prosperous" and "those who have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests."

The proposition plainly stated is that the dem-

ocratic party, which owes its voting strength to its advocacy of democratic principles and to its championship of the rights of the common people, must now turn itself over to the men who manage the great corporate enterprises, and must secure the support of organized wealth by pledging itself not to interfere with privileges, favoritism and exploitation. The principal owner of the *Chronicle* is Mr. John R. Walsh, president of the *Chicago National Bank*. He votes the republican ticket, and is on intimate terms with the corporations which his paper thinks ought to control the democratic party. Why not nominate Mr. Walsh for president? With such a candidate it would not be necessary to have a platform, and thus a great deal of contention might be avoided. The platform would be unnecessary for two reasons, first, because Mr. Walsh's environment is a guarantee that he would do nothing to disturb the enterprises and privileges of those who "have built up and manage the great commercial, industrial and transportation interests," and, second, men of that stamp care nothing for platforms and would not be bound by them in case of success. Mr. Walsh's nomination would have another advantage, namely, it would not be necessary to nominate a candidate for vice president. The convention could instruct the electors to vote for any person whom Mr. Walsh, after election, should suggest. This would enable him to choose his successor in case he should undermine his own constitution in his effort to override the federal constitution. Neither would it be necessary to have any campaign managers, because the clerks in Mr. Walsh's bank could attend to the details of the campaign, and the financiers throughout the country could be the local representatives of the organization.

If the *Chronicle's* theory is correct, such a nomination would not only transfer the party management from the "frontiersmen" to "representatives from those parts of the country that have emerged from the limited backwoods view of public affairs, etc.," but it would attract adherence from the "best elements of citizenship" (as measured by the pocketbook standard), and gain the support of those "independent voters" who allow the financiers to do their thinking for them. No doubt such a policy would swell the vote "of an apparent minority in the campaign" into "a majority at the ballot box"—provided always that the organization had enough money to buy all the republican votes, and was able at the same time (a very difficult matter) to retain the democratic vote. Probably the *Chronicle* goes on the theory that we would not need any of the democratic votes if we could buy all the republican votes.

This is the substance of the advice given by a paper controlled by a republican, but pretending to be democratic, and its advice is in entire harmony with a number of other papers owned in the same way and operated for the same purpose. Is it possible that such papers can have any influence with democrats who believe in democratic principles and think more of the party's honor than they do of any temporary success won by a sacrifice of the interests of the people?

Weyler May be Dictator.

Spain is considerably stirred up by a speech recently made by General Weyler. The following extract from his remarks contains expressions which have alarmed his countrymen:

As for dictatorship, no one thinks of such a thing. Dictators are the offspring of circumstances. For myself I may say this: "I have never thought of being one, nor do I now. Nevertheless, if my aid were asked at a moment of gravity I do not know how I would decide between political and military duties, but I would always incline toward the latter."

His speech caused an uproar and he was interrogated as to his meaning. His reply was that he was "a politician and a liberal, but before all a soldier," and that if it became necessary he would defend Spanish institutions and parliament. So far from satisfying his opponents this caused Senor Romero to say: "I take note of the declarations of the minister of war on the subject of dictatorship."

The conduct of Weyler in Cuba was such as to show that he was entirely controlled by a military spirit which ignores justice and humanity. Some will regard it as only retributive justice if he now turns upon the Spanish people at home the cruel and arbitrary power which they encouraged him to employ against the Cubans.